

IN THE DRAWINGS

Formal drawings are supplied herewith.

REMARKS

This responds to the Office Action dated May 5, 2005 and the Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment mailed on September 15, 2005.

No claims are amended, no claims are canceled, and no claims are added; as a result, claims 1-36 remain pending in this application.

Formal drawings are provided herewith and entry is respectfully requested.

§102 Rejection of the Claims

Claims 1, 2, 5 - 9, 11-12, 15-16, 19-22, 25, and 33-36 were rejected under 35 USC § 102(b) as being anticipated by Candage et al. (U.S. 5,959,490).

Applicant respectfully traverses and submits that *prima facie* anticipation has not been established. In particular, Applicant is unable to find, in Candage, a teaching or suggestion of a differential pair to receive a differential signal at a bulk input port and to generate an output signal at an output port, as recited in claim 1. Notably, Candage does not describe FIG. 1 as illustrating a differential pair but rather, Candage uses language such as “replica biasing circuitry” (column 3, line 63) and “four common-gate/dividing circuits” (column 4, lines 3-4).

Furthermore, Candaga, at column 3, lines 24-29, states:

The bulk nodes (i.e. the substrates) of MP1 and MP2 are tied to their respective sources. This is to combat the body effect and hence to prevent modulation of the transconductance gm of the driver transistors. Alternatively, in a P-well process the bulks of MP1 and MP2 can be tied to the positive power supply rail.

The bulk nodes, (i.e. the substrates) of MP3 and MP4 are tied to the positive supply rail. This minimizes the capacitance across their diffusion/bulk junction and hence allows for faster switching at nodes OUTP and OUTN.

As such, it appears that Candage does not provide a differential signal at a bulk input port but rather Candage ties the bulk terminal to a source or power supply rail.

For these and other reasons, it appears that Candage does not teach or disclose all recited elements of claim 1. Thus, it appears that the record does not evince *prima facie* anticipation on the basis of Candage. Reconsideration and allowance of pending claim 1 is respectfully requested.

As to claim 11, 19 and 33, Applicant respectfully submits that Candage does not teach or disclose a first input node at the first bulk (as recited in claim 11), or providing an input signal to

a bulk terminal of the first transistor (as recited in claim 19) or wherein each input terminal is coupled to a bulk terminal of a transistor (as recited in claim 33).

For these and other reasons, it appears that Candage does not teach or disclose all recited elements of claims 11, 19 and 33. Thus, it appears that the record does not evince *prima facie* anticipation on the basis of Candage. Reconsideration and allowance of pending claims 11, 19 and 33 is respectfully requested.

Dependent claims 2, 5-9, 12, 15-16, 19-22, 25 and 34-36 are believed to be in condition for allowance and, since each also recites an additional element, it is respectfully submitted that each is in condition for allowance.

§103 Rejection of the Claims

Claims 26, 30, and 31 were rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Candage et al. (U.S. 5,959,490).

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection and submits that *prima facie* obviousness has not been established on the basis of Candage and the knowledge of one of skill in the art at the time of the invention.

The Office Action does not appear to set forth the requisite motivation for combining Candage with the knowledge of one of skill in the art at the time of the invention. The asserted motivation for the proposed combination, according to page 3 of the Office Action, is "to have a practical use for the circuit (first amplifier) of Candage et al. since this is well known in the art and a matter of design choice." Applicant respectfully traverses and submits that such reasoning is inadequate to establish *prima facie* obviousness and is merely a generalized statement that provides no basis upon which one of skill in the art would select Candage for combining in the manner proposed. Applicant submits that the Office Action has not set forth the requisite findings, based on evidence of record, nor has the Office Action established cogent reasoning by which those findings support the assertion of obviousness.

Reconsideration and allowance of claims 26, 30 and 31 is respectfully requested.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 3-4, 10, 13, 14, 17, 18, 23, 24, and 27-29 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but were indicated to be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Applicant respectfully submits that each of claims 3-4, 10, 13, 14, 17, 18, 23, 24, and 27-29 are dependent on claims believed to be in condition for allowance and, since each also recites an additional element, it is respectfully submitted that each is in condition for allowance.

Applicant notes the absence of a rejection or objection as to claim 32. As such, Applicant respectfully requests an affirmative statement of allowability.

Serial Number: 10/749,930

Dkt: 884.C03US1 (INTEL)

Filing Date: December 29, 2003

Title: BODY EFFECT AMPLIFIER

Assignee: Intel Corporation

Conclusion

Applicant respectfully submits that the pending claims are in condition for allowance and notification to that effect is earnestly requested. The Examiner is invited to telephone Applicant's attorney ((612) 373-6911) to facilitate prosecution of this application.

If necessary, please charge any additional fees or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 19-0743.

Respectfully submitted,

ARIEL COHEN

By his Representatives,

SCHWEGMAN, LUNDBERG, WOESSNER & KLUTH, P.A.

Attorneys for Intel Corporation

P.O. Box 2938

Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402

(612) 373-6911

Date

October 17, 2005

By



David W. Black

Reg. No. 42,331

CERTIFICATE UNDER 37 CFR 1.8: The undersigned hereby certifies that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail, in an envelope addressed to: MS Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on this 17th day of October, 2005.

Name

Amy Moriarty

Signature

